



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/632,696	08/04/2000	Vincent Bahl	BTI 00.01A	2707

7590 04/23/2004
Edmund P Pfleger
Hayes Soloway Hennessey Grossman & Hage PC
130 W Cushing Street
Tucson, AZ 85701

EXAMINER

CHANNAVAJALA, SRIRAMA T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2177

DATE MAILED: 04/23/2004

12

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/632,696

Applicant(s)

BAHL, VINCENT

Examiner

Srirama Channavajjala

Art Unit

2177

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 March 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. Examiner acknowledges applicant's REMARKS filed on 3/29/2004, paper no. 11.
2. Claims 1-33 pending in this application.
3. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 12/8/2003 has been entered paper no. # 9, and a non-final Office action issued
4. Examiner acknowledges applicant's amendment filed on 11/14/2003, paper no. 6.
5. Examiner acknowledges applicant's "Remarks" filed on 8/8/2003, paper no. 4

Drawings

6. The drawings filed on 8/04/2000 are accepted by the Draftsperson under 37 CFR 1.84 or 1.152.

Information Disclosure Statement

7. The information disclosure statement filed on 11/01/2000, paper no. # 2, has been considered, a copy of PTO-1449 herewith attached to this office action, paper no. # 3.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 1-7,11,17,18-24,28 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watters, US Patent No. 5897645 in view of Williams et al., [hereafter Williams], US Patent No. 5845283.

9. As to Claims 1 and 17-18, Watters teaches a system which including 'a system For translating transaction data' [see Abstract], Watters is directed to composing electronic data interchange information, more specifically converting one data format into a common format in accordance with the document map as detailed Abstract, 'a core data structure having a plurality of predefined data fields' [col 5, line 58-67], Watters specifically suggests for example data record may define the format of one or more data fields [col 5, line 60-62], therefore data fields are integral part of Watters's teaching because data record(s) may contain one or more data fields and is part of data structure, 'first dictionary corresponding to at least one input data format' [col 3, line 42-44, line 56-58], first dictionary corresponds to Watters's first business data system fig 1, element 12, data format corresponds to data format in the data files of first business

Art Unit: 2177

data system¹², it is noted that Walters at minimum suggests at least one dictionary as detailed in fig 1; 'at least one second dictionary corresponding to at least one output data format' [col 3, line 46-49, line line 60-63], second dictionary corresponds to Watters's second business data system fig 1, element 14, data format corresponds to data format in the second business data system data files element 24, further it is noted that electronic data in the data files element 16, and second data format of data in data files element 24 are different or typically not compatible [col 3, line 60-63], therefore, Watters specifically suggests not only two business data systems, but also respective data format in the data files, 'a translation engine' [fig 1, element 28, col 3, line 48-50], translation engine corresponds to Watters's conversion system fig.1, element 28, 'engine receiving input transaction data in said input data format, engine using said first dictionary to locate, within said input transaction data, data corresponding to at least a portion of the predefined data fields of said core data structure' [col 3, line col 4, line 59-64, col 5, line 36-43], predefined data fields of said core data structure is integral part of Watters's teaching because Walters specifically suggests two business entities having two different data formats that are connected though conversion system as detailed in fig 1, further data composition system to create not only mapping, but also contains a predetermined data format that will allow the data to be exchanged between first business and second business entities as detailed in col 5, line 36-43, 'engine using said second dictionary to output transaction data, in said output data format, said output transaction data corresponding to at least a portion of the predefined data fields of said core data structure' [col 5, line 36-48, col 6, line 1-12, line 24-29].

Art Unit: 2177

It is noted that both Watters and Williams teach 'engine determining the input data format' [see Walters: col 8, line 33-36; Williams: col 4, line 35-47], both Watters and Williams teach 'input transaction data and accordingly selecting the corresponding one of said dictionaries' [Watters: col 7, line 7-19; Williams: col 5, line 49-52, line 58-64]. It is however, noted that Watters does not specifically teach 'at least two first dictionaries'. On the other hand, Williams disclosed 'at least two first dictionaries' [col 5, line 1-8, fig 3A-B].

It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicant's invention to incorporate the teachings of Williams et al., into composing electronic data interchange information of Watters because both are directed to converting data into common format, more specifically Watters is directed to electronic data interchange information, more specifically composing electronic data interchange or EDI information and other electronic information using ANSI EDI standards [col 2, line 61-67], while Williams is directed to rationalizing different data formats in a data management system, more specifically eliminating the need to modify records of each different systems, converting data records into universal data format [see abstract], and are from same field of endeavor. One of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of applicants' invention would have been motivated to modify Watters's references, more specifically fig 1 to incorporate at least two first dictionaries or two first data generators of Williams as detailed in fig 3A because that would have allowed users of Watters to provide data conversion for the data receiving from various sources or dictionaries

Art Unit: 2177

having different formats to convert into universal data format as suggested by Williams [col 5, line 1-8], thus improving the quality of transaction engine that converting the data into a universal data format on real time [Williams: col 3, line 10-17].

10. As to Claims 2, 19, Watters teaches a system which including input data format comprises data organized in segments' and fields' [col 5, line 60-63, col 7, line 13-18, line 47-50], Watters specifically teaches for example segments such as detailed in fig 4, element 114, segment corresponds to Watters document segments, 'first dictionary comprises data representing identification of a plurality of segments comprising a plurality of fields, the size of each said field, and an indicator of whether said field is required or optional [col 7, line 51-60, col 8, line 33-44, table 1].

11. As to Claims 3-4,6, and 20-21,23, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the rejection of Claim 1 above. In addition, Watters disclosed 'mapping instructions to map a predefined data field, input data format to locate data in said input data in said input data format corresponding to said predefined data field' [col 5, line 36-48, col 6, line 23-39,], mapping corresponds to Watters's mapping data records into document map.

12. As to Claims 5 and 22, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the above rejection. In addition, Watters disclosed 'at least a parameter of field size and organization' [see table: 1-2, col 9, line 6-20], table 1 and 2 is directed to specifically

Art Unit: 2177

electronic data interchange or EDI having various information fields such as element, description, and size or length as detailed in col 9, line 6-20.

13. As to Claims 7 and 24, the limitations of this claim have been noted in the above rejection. In addition, Watters disclosed 'default data to combine with data from said core data structure to output data in said output format when said at least one parameter of said output data format requires data which is not present in said core data structure' [col 10, line 5-13, line 26-36], Watters specifically suggest using ANSI EDI standard for generating the information such as detailed in table 1, further ANSI EDI standard can expand the data in table 1 to the data in the table 2 as detailed in col 9, table 2.

14. As to Claim 11 and 28, Watters teaches a system which including 'warehousing storage electronically stores data from at least a first input transaction after said transaction has been translated into said core data structure' [fig 1, col 3, line 35-40, col 7, line 24-31].

15. Claims 8-10,12-16,25-27,29-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Watters, US Patent No. 5897645, Williams et al., [hereafter Williams], US Patent No. 5845283 as applied to claims 1,18 above, and further in view of Bickerton et al., [hereafter Bickerton] US Patent No. 6041312.

Art Unit: 2177

16. As to Claims, 8 and 25, both Watters and Williams teach a system which including 'transaction data and/or said output transaction data' [Watters: col 7, line 22-31; Williams: fig 3B, col 5, line 50-57], however, both Watters and Williams do not specifically teach 'audit log'. On the other hand, Bickerton teaches 'audit log' [fig 4 and fig 11, col 6, line 22-44], audit log corresponds to Bickerton's audit log as detailed in fig 11.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to have incorporated the teachings of Bickerton et al. into composing electronic data interchange information of Watters, rationalizing different data formats in a data management system of Williams et al., because they all directed to business related data communication system [see Watters: col 3, line 42-50, gig 1; Williams: col 4, line 43-52; Bickerton: fig 3-4, col 2, line 29-41], more specifically using electronic data interchange mechanism [see Bickerton: fig 16, col 16, line 9-15], and they are from business related data field of endeavor. One of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated to have combined the references because that would have allowed users of Watters and Williams composing electronic data interface information to keep and control which relative combinations of individual audit log satisfies his or her needs as suggested by Bickerton et al. [col 2, line 50-56].

17. As to Claims 9-10,12-13,26-27, 29-30, both Watters and Bickerton teaches 'computer network, said system receiving said input transaction data from a computer via said network and sending said output transaction data to a computer via said

Art Unit: 2177

network' [Watters: fig 1, col 3, line 42-55; Bickerton: fig 2], further Bickerton teaches 'audit log' [fig 4 and fig 11, col 6, line 22-44], audit log corresponds to Bickerton's audit log as detailed in fig 11.

18. As to Claims 14-15,31-32, both Watters and Bickerton teaches 'generating data representing a plurality of output transactions from said input transaction data, wherein said input transaction data represents a single input transaction' [Watters: col 8, line 33-39; Bickerton: col 10, line 33-45].

19. As to Claims 16 and 33, Bickerton teaches a system which including 'output transactions are sent to different computers' [col 6, line 54-59].

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 3/29/2004, with respect to Claims 1-33 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive, for examiner's response, see discussion below:

.a) At page 3, Claims 1 and 18, applicant argues that "the transaction (or conversion) engine 23 of Williams does not determine the format of the input data, nor does it select a corresponding dictionary.

As to the above argument [a], examiner disagree with the applicant because firstly, Williams is directed to rationalizing different data formats in a data processing system, more specifically generating desired data outputs in a desired format regardless of the input data format [see Abstract, col 1, line 15-18], secondly, Williams also teaches input of data may be any kind of format or different data formats because these formats are being generated by various generating devices such as detailed in fig 2A, 3A, element 12,14,16,18; thirdly Williams teaches transaction or conversion device 22 determine formatted data and converted into desired format as detailed in col 4, line 43-47, col 5, line 39-43. It is also noted that Williams specifically suggests transaction engine 23 has the flexibility to meets the specific requirement with respect to converting or processing records between input and out devices as detailed in col 5, line 41-45, line 58-64.

b) At page 4, Claims 1 and 18, applicant argues "input data format identification and dictionary election steps required by Claims 1 and 18 of the present invention simply are not taught in Watters or Williams.

As to the above argument [b], Watters is directed to electronic data interchange information, more specifically, Watters teaches composing data, converting data information into a common data format [col 2, line 53-60], this common data format is defined by the format data records in the document map as detailed in col 6, line 16-18. And as explained above, Williams also teaches conversion device 22 determine formatted data and converted into desired format as detailed in col 4, line 43-47, col 5, line 39-43. As best understood by the examiner Watters and Williams both teach input data formats, more specifically Williams teaches several data generating devices that generates data in different data formats [see col 4, line 35-38] that corresponds to engine determining the input data format; while Watters teaches input record may be of any format, but essentially generating the out put of common data format that corresponds to determining the input data format [as detailed in col 6, line 13-17, col 8, line 33-36], also both Watters and Williams teach transaction data and accordingly selecting the corresponding one of dictionaries. [see Watters: col 7, line 7-19; Williams: col 5, line 49-52, line 58-64] and are from the same field of endeavor.

Therefore, Applicant's remarks are deemed not to be persuasive, and Claims 1-7, 11, 17, 18-24, 28 stand rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over

Art Unit: 2177

Watters in view of Williams et al.; and dependent claims 8-10,12-16,25-27,29-33 are obvious over Watters and Williams in view of Bickerton et al.,

Conclusion

The prior art made of record

a.	US Patent No.	5897645
b.	US Patent No.	6041312
c.	US Patent No.	5845283

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure

e.	US Patent No.	6330563
f.	US Patent No.	6408292
g.	US Patent No.	6256676
h.	US Patent No.	5878419
i.	US Patent No.	5893076
j.	US Patent No.	5956688
k.	US Patent No.	6360223
l.	US Patent No.	6154748
m.	US Patent No.	6490718
n.	US Patent No.	6625597

Art Unit: 2177

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).


A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Srirama Channavajjala whose telephone number is (703) 308-8538. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 8:00 AM to 5:30 PM Eastern Time. The TC2100's Customer Service number is (703) 306-5631.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, John E. Breene, can be reached on (703) 305-9790. The fax phone numbers for the organization where the application or proceeding is assigned are as follows:

703/746-7238	(After Final Communication)
703/872-9306	(Offical Communications)
703/746-7240	(For Status inquiries, draft communication)

Any inquiry of general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9600.

sc 
Patent Examiner.
April 21, 2004.